Vol. X, No. 14 HUMAN EVENTS April 8, 1953

TWO TO GET READY

APR 15 '53

By WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY, JR.

IT'S MORE than two weeks now since Senator Knowland snarled at Senator Dirksen, Senator Taft snarled at Senator McCarthy, Senator McCarthy snarled at Secretary Dulles, Secretary Dulles snarled at Security Chief McLeod, and President Eisenhower snarled at the American voters, all of which is just what his appointment of Charles Bohlen amounted to.

The heat of the debate has died down, but some rancor remains. And this rancor may well fester and create a serious emotional fissure right through the hierarchy of the Republican Party unless quite a few very important people, notably Mr. Taft, do some serious thinking; the sort of thinking that was seldom in evidence in the ponderous, self-conscious oblique garrulity indulged in over the Bohlen issue.*

The madcap gentility of a diseased civilization condones a relatively painless solution to many nagging and embarrassing problems. Let a highly placed satrap say, "Sir! you doubt my word?" (or, "You doubt my loyalty?") — and a collective gasp is disgorged from the press and podium, the nations' moralists incant the evils of McCarthyism, and important issues remain unsettled.

HERE IS ONE ISSUE THAT was not settled the week before last: is there good and sufficient reason for the Senate of the United States, an independent legislative chamber invested, under the Constitution, with the controlling voice on the future of Presidential nominees, to rely on the judgment of John Foster Dulles on loyalty and security? Most emphatically not.

Let us remember that this has nothing whatever to do with any other qualifications which Mr. Dulles may have, and may some day evidence, which might in future years entitle him to wear the mantle of Talleyrand, Palmerston and Hay. Albert Jack Nock wrote in his autobiography, "I am probably the poorest judge of character now living; none could be worse. A person might be a survivor of the saints or he might be the devil's rag-baby, for

* Senator McCarthy and Senator Bridges made excellent speeches; Senator Ferguson delivered a scholarly and masterful indictment of Yalta, and proceeded to commit the logical sin of the undistributed middle, by drawing on this indictment, incredibly, to justify a vote for Bohlen.

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all I should know." And yet, Nock lets his readers infer that he was a first-class editor just the same, just as, I repeat, Dulles may turn out to be a first-class Secretary of State.

The principal reason why the Senate and the people should have no confidence in Dulles on matters relating to loyalty and security is his reversal, in February, of the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board's finding that a "reasonable doubt" does indeed exist as to John Carter Vincent's loyalty. Not only did Dulles overrule this highly cautious board, he also exonerated Vincent on the lesser, looser, laxer score by declaring that neither is there "reasonable doubt" that Vincent is a security risk!

Now, the evidence against Vincent, garnered from a study of his career, is very persuasive. At the very least, it argues that he is a security, if not a loyalty risk. But even apart from Vincent's activities and associations in China, there is the testimony of Louis Budenz, who asserts he knew Vincent to be a member of the Communist Party. Therefore, in exonerating Vincent under the present loyalty standard ("reasonable doubt" — Executive Order 10241, April, 1951) and the security standard ("reasonable doubt" — State Department Memorandum, June 8, 1948), Mr. Dulles in effect declared that there is no reasonable doubt but that Louis Budenz is a liar.

And this in spite of the fact that on the basis of thousands of pages of secret testimony, corroborated wherever possible, the FBI gives Budenz the highest reliability rating.

It isn't difficult to imagine the chaos that must have overwhelmed loyalty and security circles, both in the State Department and in the Civil Service Commission, after what amounted to a castigation by Mr. Dulles of the judgment on Vincent. If Vincent is not a security risk, security officers must be asking themselves, who in the name of heaven is? And what are we doing here? After all, Mr. Dulles has in effect declared that *we* are unreasonable, which indeed we are if doubts as to Mr. Vincent's security are unreasonable.

Mr. Dulles dealt the federal security program, an important issue during the campaign, an Achesonian blow.

Consequently, when Dulles vouched for Bohlen before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at least one Senator should have said, "But Mr. Dulles, how would *you* know what is or what isn't a security risk? Kindly confine your remarks about Mr. Bohlen to his other qualifications." This, mind you, would be to question the palpably questionable *judgment* of Dulles *in this specific field,* and has nothing whatever to do with impugning his chivalry, or anything else.

Subsequently, when word got out that Mr. Dulles' chief of security, Scott McLeod, had his own ideas about Bohlen, the Senate ought, as one man, to have expressed a straightfor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ward, unswerving insistence that as far as it was concerned, Mr. McLeod's judgment (note, well, his judgment, not his word), is, in the absence of any blots on Mr. McLeod's record, infinitely more relevant than Mr. Dulles'.

The fact that Mr. Sparkman and Mr. Taft were given some of the files (remember when the Tydings Committee was given the files on McCarthy's 81 cases, and subsequently cleared the lot, including Service, Vincent, Lattimore and a half dozen other embarrassments?) hardly changes the nature of the issue. Nor is the ultimate question, whether or not Bohlen is in fact a security risk (I assume he is not), important. The question to be decided is whether a Secretary of State is, in the nature of things, the soundest witness in matters of loyalty and security. If Congress will continue automatically to put the greatest weight on the judgment of the Secretary in these matters, as Senator Taft indicated was right and proper, then high competence in this field must become a necessary qualification for the job. And if it is, Mr. Dulles should apparently not have been confirmed.

In short, burdened down with protestations about the loyalty, patriotism, integrity and honor of almost everybody, the Senate forgot altogether to focus its attention on the central issue, to face it manfully, and to come out and say it: "Mr. Dulles, sir, you're a fine American, a fine family man, and maybe even a fine diplomat. But just because you're Secretary of State doesn't mean you have infallible judgment about matters of loyalty and security. We've no evidence that you could distinguish between a survivor of the saints and the devil's rag-baby. So please move over and let us have a talk with Mr. McLeod."

THE OTHER ISSUE, ultimately a more important one, has to do with the very incautious, disturbingly supine apotheosis of General Eisenhower, at the hands of the Senate. Mr. Taft is chiefly responsible here.

It is one thing for a political party to present to the people the candidate it deems best qualified to be President, and quite another thing to take that frightening extra step and say that he is also, by the way, infallible.

Let us take Mr. Eisenhower at his repeated words of last summer that our retreat from victory was not a historical necessity, that bad judgment by flesh and blood American citizens was a strong factor in the expansion of Russia, and in the shrinking of the free world.

Now, *who* were the Americans responsible for bad judgment? Certainly right at the top of the list are the men who authorized the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam agreements. The principals at the diplomatic Waterloos are dead or dismissed. But some subordinate staff members are still around, and some of them, in the course of things, are graduating upwards. The question is, have time and experience matured their judgment?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Mr. Bohlen's, by his own, admirably frank admission. He still thinks Yalta was a good thing, all things considered.

So what have we got? An ambassador to Russia who is endorsed not only by the Republican President of the United States, but also by Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., author, as far as I know, of the legend of the Necessity of Yalta, who dubs Bohlen, "the best possible candidate for the job".

But Mr. Schlesinger and Mr. Eisenhower are supposed to represent two different points of view about foreign policy; and, unfortunately, there is *prima facie* evidence that Mr. Schlesinger is less liable to back a hard anti-Communist than Mr. Eisenhower to back a soft anti-Communist. Mr. Schlesinger is a hard-headed, realistic, resourceful McLiberal. We can be sure that his enthusiasm for Bohlen does not stem exclusively from his admiration of Bohlen's mastery of the Russian language. In other words, to the extent that there *is* a difference in the foreign policies of the Americans for Democratic Action and the Republican Party, somebody is being taken in; because Bohlen cannot at the same time advance the goals of one and of the other. As with the inexplicable appointment of Dr. James Conant, there is cause to conclude, ruefully, that General Eisenhower in some matters is acting by instinct and intuition, and that these, pitted against the unrelenting realism of the ADA, are likely to come off second best.

This is not to argue that General Eisenhower should consult Arthur Schlesinger and proceed to disqualify from public office all persons whom Mr. Schlesinger admires (though, come to think of it, his batting average would be very good if he followed this little formula); but the Senate of the United States should at least reject the New Deal philosophy that it exists to confirm Presidential appointments and legislate Presidential suggestions.

The servility of Congress is one of the greatest threats to freedom; and yet, unfortunately, Franklin Roosevelt's notions on the proper function of Congress have affected the thinking of most of us, and even such doughty libertarians as Robert Taft and Homer Ferguson. It is unfortunately a reasonable assumption that if it had been Mr. Truman who nominated Mr. Bohlen for this office, or if it had been he who nominated James Conant, many more Republicans would have withstood this affront to what is left of the free world. That Mr. Eisenhower made the nominations doesn't change Conant or Bohlen; but it says something about Republican opportunism.

Republican leaders must shrink from bestowing infallibility on Dwight Eisenhower. He is human and will make mistakes. There is little point in the Senate's compounding these mistakes, as it has done twice now, with Conant and Bohlen.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 14 Wednesday, April 8, 1953 Washington, D. C.

APR 15 '53

Contraband: The Pentagon possesses a photograph of a vessel, flying the British ensign and described as carrying Chinese Communist soldiers from southern China to northern China ports — according to special information relayed to this column in the past few days.

We understand that this picture is but one item in a large file of documentation proving that some of our allies have been helping the Red enemy. The file, as our information goes, has been compiled by the intelligence division of one of our three armed services. This service has been indignant about the perfidy of our "friends" and has sought to get the story around in Government circles, since the State Department has been either unwilling or unable to put a stop to the traffic.

Whether or not Senator McCarthy has seen this photo and will bring it out for public view, we have not been able to ascertain. But it is likely that the Senator and his investigators have profited, at least indirectly, from this file of information, in their partially successful efforts to persuade Greek shipowners to stop their illicit trade with our enemies. It is important to note that the Senator was dealing with Greek shipowners who have their headquarters in the U.S. So far as we can discover, he has not touched the very heart of this illicit traffic — the group of Greek shipowners with headquarters in London — as first revealed in HUMAN EVENTS, December 31, 1952. We said then that the British were in the position to put pressure on the Greek interests in London to stop the trade, but that no American pressure on the British to do so had been exerted, so far, to put an end to it.

In view of the existence of this explosive arsenal of intelligence, there should be no surprise that Secretary Dulles not only thanked Senator McCarthy, but endorsed his efforts to terminate this disgraceful traffic.

Talk of the Town: If Dulles' star should fade, Governor Dewey would be willin'. The story going the rounds is that Dewey offered to be "available" for the job of Secretary of State last November at the time when Dulles and John J. McCloy seemed to be deadlocked for the job.

One of Ike's aides asked Dewey for his advice and was surprised to hear Dewey say, "Why don't you name me?" The aide replied, "But last summer you said you could not afford to take the job." Dewey's explanation: "But since then I've made a killing in Cinerama and now I can afford it."

However, the Ike aide preferred Dulles, and Dewey's offer was brushed aside. Today, it is felt that, if Dulles gets into difficulties, there will develop a great publicity drive for the man in Albany.

● Governor Sherman Adams (Ike's "Assistant President"), has selected many individuals of a strongly internationalist trend for high Government positions. It is believed that this is the result of the influence of Mrs. Adams, who for long has been an ardent booster of "one world" causes.

● Financial experts of the Administration say about the prospects of peace — "It looks like this is it." They concede that the "peace" may not last more than a year, but they expect that some "pause" will occur not later than July 1. These circles seem unworried by a resultant recession, although they grant that the unemployment figures might jump to four or five million. "An adjustment" which may "hurt some" would not last long, they think.

Korea: One of the big traps which worry those who want a durable peace is the exchange of prisoners of war (not to be confused with the present parleys at Panmunjom for exchange of sick and wounded

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POWs). Diplomatic observers fear that Acheson committed us to a dangerous plan and they note with dismay that the none-too-bright Senator Lodge, Jr., our representative in the UN, unfortunately reiterated our support of this plan. They refer to what is called the "India Plan", to which Acheson gave adherence. The Soviet Union turned it down last year, probably because it gave lip service to the principle of permitting Soviet slaves to refuse return to their native land. But, now, there is apprehension that the Malenkov regime, in its new conciliatory phase, will suddenly accept the India Plan.

The danger that we will lose our shirts if the India Plan is accepted is considerable. The plan has never been properly understood by the U.S. public. In principle, it opposed forced repatriation of prisoners. However, the practical details of the plan seemed designed to bring about just that. The Indians proposed a "neutral" commission made up equally of Swiss, Swedes, Czechs and Poles to supervise screening and repatriation. The Swiss and Swedes naturally would act correctly and fairly. But the Czechs and Poles are obviously Moscow puppets.

The plan provides that in case of a deadlock a "neutral" umpire would be named. The chances are that some pro-Soviet "neutral" like India or some Soviet stooge like Burma would be the compromise choice. One can imagine what would then happen to unfortunate prisoners, who did not want to return to the Soviet homeland. Inasmuch as many of these prisoners surrendered to us, in response to American psychological warfare appeals and promises of fair treatment, our reputation would be irreparably damaged. Never again could we count on effective results from our psychological warfare, which according to Secretary Dulles, must play an important role in our prosecution of the cold war.

Cloak and Dagger: Experts on Soviet Russia display keen interest in the surprising *volte-face* in the matter of those fifteen doctors in Moscow. It was officially announced last week that the Fifteen (including some Jewish physicians) were cleared of treasonable charges. What does this mean? Experts speculate that last January (when the doctor purge was first reported) there existed a conflict between the MGD (Ministry of State Security, a sort of counterespionage agency) and the more famous MVD (Ministry of Internal Affairs, overall secret police and slave labor organization) on this doctor matter. Then, right after the death of Stalin, the MVD absorbed the MGD. Who killed whom — isn't known here. But, there's a feeling that the news signifies deep, internal rifts in the Soviet regime.

Bricker Amendment: The unfavorable reaction of Secretary Dulles (presumably speaking for the Administration) to the proposed Bricker amendment is indicative. In one way or another, every amendment to the Constitution since the Twelfth (and excepting the repeal of the prohibition amendment) has enhanced the importance of the Federal government at the expense of either the states or Congress. The Bricker amendment would put a brake on the power of the Executive in the matter of treaty making, and — of course — the Executive does not like it. If for no other reason than that the Bricker amendment is a step in the other direction it deserves the support of all Americans who fear the centralizing trend.

Press: In the past 48 hours, two sharp criticisms of the press have stirred much discussion here. Senator Taft, in an issue of *Look*, just published, charged that the majority of Washington columnists and commentators "tend to be anti-Republican". At the same time, there appeared a protest circulated among 700 newspapers declaring that Senator McCarthy had been unfairly treated by segments of press, radio and television. The signers of the latter protest included John Chamberlain, John T. Flynn, Felix Morley, Eugene Lyons and the editors of HUMAN EVENTS.

Specifically, this protest noted that hardly any literary critics reviewed the Wisconsin Senator's book, *McCarthyism, The Fight for America* (Devin-Adair), a well-documented answer to the various charges levelled at the Senator. Yet, Owen Lattimore's book, *Ordeal by Slander*, attacking the Senator, received the "widest coverage" and the "most extravagant and uncritical support". Lattimore is under indictment for perjury and will come to trial next fall.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The protest has particular point just now in view of the more recent outbursts of criticism of McCarthy. In the past few weeks, the Senator was assailed (among other charges) for proposing that Bohlen be given a lie detector test, although such tests are given by the State Department in the case of "security risks". Again, the Wisconsin Senator was attacked for negotiating a deal with Greek shipowners to cease their traffic with the Red enemy — which prominent portions of the press seemed to regard as some unique kind of crime. David Lawrence, Editor of *U.S. News*, ably defended McCarthy, pointing out that the Senator had not dealt with a foreign power, but only with foreign private individuals; and recalling that the elder Sen. Henry Cabot Lodge, during the League fight 1919-20, had negotiated an agreement with British officials. Many people here fear that a clique of columnists and papers have already badly damaged the reputation of the American press by an orgy of passionate condemnation of a man whom they, and groups to whom they cater, do not like.

Social Security Rumblings: One of President Eisenhower's first official acts was to appoint Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby to be Federal Security Administrator. At the same time it was made clear that he wanted Mrs. Hobby in the Cabinet (the FSA is a "lower case" agency). In pursuance of this scheme Reorganization Pan No. 1, creating a Cabinet Department of Health, Education and Welfare out of the Federal Security Administration was sent to Congress. On March 30 by a voice vote (only 6 Senators being present!) the Senate passed and sent to the White House H.J. Res. 223 (already approved by the House) which not only endorsed Plan No. 1 but made it effective 10 days after Presidential approval. Approval was immediate. All this seems regular enough, but veteran observers find the business rather mysterious and suspicious.

Mrs. Hobby has no discernible enemies and her frank admissions to the *U.S. News* that she knew little about social security and would have to move cautiously, had the effect of disarming criticisms. The lady thus far has made one single appointment: Jack Beardwood to be her secretary. Mr. Beardwood is no authority on social security either. Hand in hand, in January, these two set out to explore the FSA jungle. Promptly they discovered that though Mrs. Hobby might ostensibly be the lord of an Agency employing more than 37,000 persons she could fire but three or four! This circumstance was advanced as one of the chief reasons for speed in approving Plan No. 1 — else how could the entrenched New Deal bureaucrats be got rid of? But was that the real reason?

Suspicion has centered on the nature of Plan No. 1 itself, for scrutiny reveals that it provides for scarcely any reorganization at all. On the contrary, for the most part, it simply took the FSA with its constituent bureaus and elevated it to Cabinet status. Competent lawyers read the Plan in a daze. It so closely resembled previous plans submitted in the interest of Oscar Ewing (Truman's FSA Administrator) — plans roundly denounced by Republicans — as to cause stupefaction. Did the Republicans propose to clean house with the FSA or didn't they? Who drew the Plan anyhow? Had the Fair Deal crowd managed to get in the back door and help draft the Plan? No answers to these questions are yet forthcoming.

But interest has been just as much focussed upon Congress and the entrenched Social Security bureaucracy as it has been on Mrs. Hobby. Shortly after taking over in January as Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, tax-cutter Dan Reed appointed Rep. Carl Curtis of Nebaska as the head of a subcommittee to investigate the social security system. Curtis *does* know the score on social security, and chance has made him the pivot on which all hope of reform now turns. He is determined that, for once, there shall be an honest and searching investigation that will come up with some honest and forthright proposals.

His opportunity is very great; his position is difficult. On one side are those who are both illiterate about the subject and fearful of any sort of action. On the other side is the bureaucratic camarilla, skilled in propaganda and with contacts built up over many years. Mrs. Hobby is of a mind to cooperate with Curtis but, as she admits, her knowledge and experience is meager. Curtis must be nimble, adroit, resolute and courageous; he deserves the watchful support of every citizen who wants to see an honest and decent job done.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany Plots With the Kremlin, by T. H. Tetens. New York: Henry Schuman. $3.75. Reviewed by William Henry Chamberlin.

If there were a prize for the most mischievous and addlepated book of the year, this work would be a strong contender. The author, described in the publisher's note as "a naturalized American of German origin", hates Germany and the Germans with an undiscriminating and consuming hatred that makes him quite the most unbalanced guide in history and contemporary politics.

Indeed his obsession with imaginary German plots and diabolical German cunning strongly suggests the paranoid fancies of fanatical anti-Semites about Jews and of doctrinaire Marxists about capitalism. One of his derivative obsessions is "geo-politicians"; they keep popping into his fantastically distorted story like King Charles' head in one of Dickens' novels.

The thesis which Mr. Tetens tries to sell to the American public is that Dr. Konrad Adenauer, the most courageous, clearsighted anti-Communist statesman in Europe today, is a Machiavellian schemer who plans to rearm Germany and then cast in his lot with the Kremlin. Adenauer, a devout Catholic, a believer in the heritage of common western European civilization, a man willing to make sweeping concessions in national sovereignty to achieve the goal of a united anti-Communist Europe, is slandered as "a fanatical believer in the pan-German gospel that the Fatherland should rule Europe and the world".

And of course Adenauer is hand in glove with those devilish geo-politicians who, in the Tetens *delirium tremens,* are responsible for all the unpleasant things that have happened in the world including the cold war. Despite a pretentious claim to "documentation", based on an assortment of newspaper clippings of the most varied reliability and authenticity, there is not an iota of proof in the book that Adenauer, or any member of his Cabinet, or any leader of the opposition Social Democrats, has been "plotting with Moscow".

What the author offers as "proof" consists of largely long dissertations allegedly published by an organization described as the German Geo-Political Centre in Madrid. Even if such an organization exists and has published such material there is no indication that it exercises any influence on German policy; most Germans, it is safe to say, do not know that any such group exists and care less.

Everything that does not fit in with the author's preconceived pattern of a Germany eager to fall into the arms of the Soviet Union is ignored. He does not pause to explain the magnificent stand of West Berlin against the Soviet blockade or the tens of thousands of refugees who have fled from the Soviet Zone since the beginning of this year.

The rearming of Germany within the framework of a common West European defense effort is the last best chance of saving Europe from ultimate Soviet conquest by force or threat of force. The attempt of Mr. Tetens to take us back to the days of Roosevelt and the Morgenthau Plan is the worst kind of sabotage of a cardinal aim of American foreign policy.

Of course America is a free country where every crackpot can speak his piece. But what are we to think when the publisher can quote approving comments on this book from the book review sections of the *New York Times* and The New York *Herald Tribune?* Is the American public to be taken for the same kind of ride on Germany as on China not so long ago?

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED